United Nations A/61/815

General Assembly

Distr.: General
20 March 2007

Original: English

Sixty-first session
Agenda item 128
Administration of justice at the United Nations

Report of the Redesign Panel on the United Nations system of administration of justice

Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

I. Introduction

1. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions has considered the report of the Redesign Panel on the United Nations system of administration of justice (A/61/205) as well as the related comments of the Secretary-General (A/61/758). The Committee also had before it the following reports of the Secretary-General on administration of justice in the Secretariat: activities of the Ombudsman (A/61/524); implementation of resolution 59/283 (A/61/342); and outcome of the work of the Joint Appeals Board during 2004 and 2005 and statistics on the disposition of cases and work of the Panel of Counsel (A/61/71). During its consideration of the item, the Committee met with the Under-Secretary-General for Management, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management, the United Nations Ombudsman and other representatives of the Secretary-General, who provided additional information and clarifications.

2. The Advisory Committee was provided with a copy of the report on the seventh special session of the Staff-Management Coordination Committee, which took place in Nairobi from 29 January to 6 February 2007 (SMCC/SS-VII/2007). The Committee met with the President and other representatives of the Staff Union of New York, at their request, who presented their views to the Committee.

3. The report of the panel of external and independent experts (Redesign Panel) was submitted on 28 July 2006 pursuant to General Assembly resolution 59/283.

4. The Secretary-General's comments on the recommendations of the Redesign Panel, along with the estimate of time and resources needed for their implementation, were submitted on 23 February 2007. In the preparation of his comments, the Secretary-General held consultations with managers and staff representatives of the Secretariat and the United Nations funds and programmes.

07-27648 (E) 210307

The Secretary-General indicates that his note also reflects his consultations with the Staff-Management Coordination Committee and informs the General Assembly of the instances where he endorses or differs from the modifications agreed by the Committee.

5. The Redesign Panel proposes the establishment of a new, decentralized, professional and independent system of internal justice for the United Nations and its funds and programmes at both the informal and formal levels. It makes recommendations in a number of areas, including the following:

(a) Establishment of a new Office of Administration of Justice for the United Nations and its funds and programmes;

(b) Strengthening of the informal system of internal justice, essentially through the integration and decentralization of the existing offices of the Ombudsman in the Secretariat and the funds and programmes, the monitoring of maladministration and the mediation of disputes;

(c) Establishment of a new two-tiered system of formal justice, comprising a first-instance decentralized Tribunal (United Nations Dispute Tribunal) and a second-level appellate Tribunal (United Nations Appeals Tribunal), both composed of independent, professional judges with the power to issue binding decisions. It is proposed to rename the existing United Nations Administrative Tribunal as the United Nations Appeals Tribunal and to amend its Statute to include a new appellate jurisdiction;

(d) Extension of the scope and jurisdiction of the Organization's system of internal justice;

(e) Establishment of a professionalized and decentralized Office of Counsel to provide advice and legal representation for staff members and the Secretary-General.

6. The Redesign Panel also makes observations and recommendations on such issues as accountability, transparency and training that cut across all components of the system of internal justice.

7. Finally, the Redesign Panel recommends that the proposed new justice system be established by a resolution of the General Assembly and, subject to such approval, to become operational on 1 January 2008, with a period of transition.

II. General observations

8. The issue of administration of justice has been of long-standing concern to the Advisory Committee, which commented on the necessity for reform as far back as the fortieth session of the General Assembly.[1] **The Committee welcomes the report of the Redesign Panel, as well as the note by the Secretary-General. It believes that the proposals constitute an important step in the reform of the system of internal justice of the United Nations.**

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Supplement No. 7* (A/40/7), paras. 67-73.

9. The Advisory Committee notes that the Secretary-General agrees with most of the recommendations of the Redesign Panel with some modifications and that he also endorses most of the changes proposed by the Staff-Management Coordination Committee. The Committee's remarks are presented in the same sequence as that of the report of the Redesign Panel to the extent possible so as to facilitate the General Assembly's consideration of the issues and recommendations contained in that report.

10. The Advisory Committee also notes that the Secretary-General's comments do not address all of the recommendations of the Redesign Panel and that an intersessional working group was established by the Staff-Management Coordination Committee to discuss issues relating to disciplinary proceedings (see A/61/205, paras. 24, 27, 161 and 163). The Secretary-General will inform the General Assembly of the outcome of these deliberations and provide his comments on any subsequent actions to be undertaken in respect of the disciplinary process.

11. Furthermore, deadlines for filing complaints to the United Nations Dispute and Appeals Tribunals, as set out in paragraphs 88, 89 and 95 of the Redesign Panel report, will be elaborated in the draft statutes for the respective Tribunals that will be submitted to the General Assembly for approval. The Advisory Committee notes that the Sixth Committee is holding a resumed session in March 2007 to continue its consideration of administration of justice at the United Nations. In the sections below, the Advisory Committee points to a number of issues that, in its view, merit further examination and clarification, on which it recommends that the Sixth Committee provide guidance to the General Assembly. The Advisory Committee points out that the outcome of these consultations and deliberations may have an impact on the proposals for the redesign of the system of internal justice.

12. As indicated in paragraph 44 of the note by the Secretary-General, the redesigned justice system would apply to the United Nations and its funds and programmes, and this would involve sharing the costs of the Office of Staff Legal Assistance, the Office of the Ombudsman, the Office of Administration of Justice and the Tribunals. The note also indicates that cost-sharing for the current system is based on workload statistics for judgements issued and cases disposed.

13. The Advisory Committee points out that the proposed system of internal justice would entail a considerable change from current practice in all its aspects: the replacement of the voluntary peer review by a professionalized two-tier judicial system that issues binding decisions; the enlargement of the informal system to include field operations and non-staff personnel; the integration and decentralization of the system across several organizations; an increased focus on the informal resolution of disputes; and a considerable increase in the expected caseloads. The current workload statistics are therefore not realistic indicators of the future utilization of the system, nor of the resulting resource requirements. **The Committee recommends that additional efforts be made to identify and quantify the cost parameters underlying the related resource requirements. It considers that more specific cost-sharing arrangements have to be developed and agreed upon by the participating organizations before the proposed system of internal justice is implemented.**

III. A unified system

Scope and jurisdiction

14. The Advisory Committee notes that the Redesign Panel expressed its concerns with respect to the limited access to the current system of internal justice, which is applicable only to United Nations staff members as stipulated by the United Nations regulations and rules. The Panel proposes extending the system to any person appointed by the Secretary-General, the General Assembly or any principal organ to a remunerated post, or performing personal services under contract with the United Nations, such as consultants and locally recruited personnel of peacekeeping missions (see A/61/205, para. 156 and notes to annex I; and A/61/758, para. 12). The Panel cites paragraph 19 of General Assembly resolution 59/283 in which the Assembly requested that the Office of the Ombudsman continue and expand its outreach activities, in particular to local, national and General Service staff, in order to facilitate equal access and awareness-raising, bearing in mind the structure, activities and operational environment of the Organization, considering it a clear guideline towards more comprehensive coverage and expansion of the system to other categories of personnel.

15. A suggested modification for extending the definition of staff in the Statute of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal is provided in the notes to annex I to the report of the Redesign Panel. In paragraph 157 the Panel proposes that consultations be held with the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund and other bodies subject to the administrative jurisdiction of the Administrative Tribunal with a view to amending its Statute to expand the definition of staff, to enable it to grant the relief it considers appropriate and otherwise to bring it into harmony with the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization (ILO) (see also A/61/758, para. 35).

16. In paragraph 10 of his note, the Secretary-General concurs with the proposals to broaden the scope of the new system, indicating that the following individuals would have access to the informal and formal system of justice:

> Staff members, former staff members and persons making claims in the name of deceased staff members and all persons who perform work by way of their own personal service for the Organization, no matter the type of contract by which they are engaged, but not including military or police personnel in peacekeeping operations, volunteers (other than United Nations Volunteers), interns, type II gratis personnel (as defined in ST/AI/1999/6), or persons performing work in conjunction with the supply of goods or services extending beyond their own personal service or pursuant to a contract entered into with a supplier, contractor or consulting firm.

17. The Secretary-General further indicates that, although the full impact of the enlargement of the scope of the justice system on the actual number of cases arising in both the informal and formal systems is not yet possible to estimate, during 2006, approximately 35,000 individuals were engaged by United Nations funds and programmes under a variety of contractual arrangements (see A/61/758, para. 10, footnote 2), commonly referred to as holders of special service agreements. Consequently, the Advisory Committee was informed that it is estimated that the expanded new system would provide recourse to some 90,000 individuals, including

more than 30,000 staff employed in field operations and up to 35,000 contractors not covered under the current system.

18. The Advisory Committee requested additional information on the rationale for the proposed extension of the scope of the system of internal justice to non-staff as well as on the current arrangements for resolving disputes in those cases. It was informed that such cases were subject to the rules of arbitration of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and that for the period from 1996 to 2000, 16 cases had been referred to the Office of Legal Affairs. Information on cases that were not processed by the Office of Legal Affairs was not available. The Secretary-General concurred with the recommendation of the Redesign Panel that persons working side by side with staff should also have a meaningful means of redress in the case of the violation of their rights, and that such means should be offered by any good employer.

19. The Advisory Committee was also informed that, should the General Assembly agree with the expansion of the scope of the justice system as recommended by the Redesign Panel, the dispute resolution clause currently contained in the contracts of consultants and individual contractors would be modified accordingly.

20. The Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations draw a clear distinction between staff and non-staff. Services of staff members are secured through recruitment and appointment, while those of consultants and individual contractors are based on very different selection criteria, procedures and contractual arrangements. For consultants and individual contractors, the mechanisms for resolving disputes between parties are, of necessity, specific to the terms of each type of contract.

21. **The Advisory Committee notes that no compelling reasons or impact analysis were provided, either by the Secretary-General or the Redesign Panel, to widen the scope of coverage of the system. The Committee considers therefore that the system of internal justice should continue to apply only to those individuals covered by the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations. The Committee is of the opinion that, should the General Assembly decide to consider expanding the scope of the system, a further in-depth analysis would be required.**

Office of Administration of Justice

22. The Redesign Panel recommends the establishment of an Office of Administration of Justice, which will have overall responsibility for the administrative coordination of the United Nations system of internal justice, including the supervision and coordination of the registries and the Office of Counsel as well as the management of financial and budgetary matters for the formal justice system. The Panel considers that a separate Office of Administration of Justice, with operational and budgetary autonomy, would ensure the institutional independence of the system of internal justice (see A/61/205, para. 124).

23. The recommended staffing of the Office of Administration of Justice is contained in annex III to the report of the Redesign Panel. Resource requirements, estimated on the basis of the proposals of the Redesign Panel and modified by the

Staff-Management Coordination Committee, are provided in the note by the Secretary-General (see A/61/758, paras. 38-45, annex III).

24. **The Advisory Committee has no objection to the establishment of the Office of Administration of Justice. Given the additional steps still to be taken on this matter, the Committee is not yet in a position to make any pronouncements on the specific staffing proposals, including the numbers, grading structure and functions to be performed and resource requirements presented by the Secretary-General. It therefore recommends that consideration of these requirements be deferred, pending the adoption by the General Assembly of further decisions on the system of internal justice (see paras. 10-13 and 21 above).**

25. **The Advisory Committee agrees with the proposal of the Secretary-General to rename the Office of Counsel as the Office of Staff Legal Assistance (A/61/758, para. 9).**

IV. The informal system

Office of the Ombudsman

26. The Redesign Panel recommends a merger of the existing United Nations Ombudsman, the United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Population Fund/United Nations Children's Fund/United Nations Office for Project Services Ombudsperson and the Mediator of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees into an integrated new Office of the Ombudsman with a centralized administration at Headquarters and largely decentralized operations, to provide easier access and quicker response (see A/61/205, para. 164). It recommends that the Office of the Ombudsman be strengthened by combining the functions of formal mediation with proactive monitoring of maladministration, that a Mediation Division be established within the Office of the Ombudsman and that the panels on discrimination and other grievances be abolished (see ibid., paras. 166-168). The Panel also recommends that Ombudsmen be appointed within the Office of the Ombudsman to serve peacekeeping missions with large numbers of civilian staff with the provision being made under the missions' budgets (see ibid., para. 171).

27. The Secretary-General agrees with those recommendations (see A/61/758, paras. 12-15). He proposes an additional regional Ombudsman's office in Dakar and in the peacekeeping operations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo), Liberia (United Nations Mission in Liberia) and the Sudan (United Nations Mission in the Sudan) (see ibid., para 14).

28. **The Advisory Committee agrees with these proposals, bearing in mind what is stated in paragraphs 10 to 13, 21 and 24 above. It recommends that a set of objective criteria, in addition to that of the number of civilian staff proposed by the Redesign Panel, be developed and documented for determining which peacekeeping missions should have an ombudsman.**

29. The Redesign Panel recommends that the Ombudsmen be appointed by the Secretary-General or the executive heads of the funds and programmes, selected

from a list of candidates constituted by a selection committee composed of a staff representative, a management representative and two distinguished outside ombudsmen, one appointed by the staff and one by management, and chaired by a third distinguished Ombudsman appointed jointly by the Secretary-General and the executive heads of the funds and programmes (see A/61/205, para. 165 and A/61/758, para. 13).

30. **The Advisory Committee emphasizes the need to ensure that qualification requirements are met and to promote transparency in the nomination and selection processes. The Committee stresses the importance of setting clear, relevant and verifiable qualifications and recommends that the selection committee develop procedures to verify the qualifications of prospective candidates. Due attention should be paid to ensuring wide geographic representation, both of the members of the selection committee and the candidates placed on the lists presented to the executive heads for selection. Furthermore, efforts should be made to ensure that the opportunities for those positions are widely circulated in order to ensure a large pool of potential candidates from which to draw, as well as to maintain the technical nature of the selection committee.**

31. **The Advisory Committee emphasizes the need for ombudsmen to encourage staff to seek resolution through the informal system.**

V. The formal system

Management evaluation

32. The Redesign Panel proposes that administrative review before action in the formal justice system be abolished (A/61/205, para. 158). The review is currently carried out by the Administrative Law Unit within the Office of Human Resources Management at Headquarters, regardless of where the staff member is posted. The Secretary-General agrees that the Administrative Law Unit has not fulfilled its function and suggests that this is due mainly to under-resourcing, which leads to unacceptable delays.

33. The Secretary-General proposes instead to introduce a new management evaluation function. The evaluation would constitute the first, mandatory step of the formal proceedings. It would be designed to avoid unnecessary litigation by permitting management an early opportunity to correct any errors or take an appropriate remedy where it found that a decision was improperly taken (see A/61/758, paras. 29-31). The Secretary-General indicates that staff members would apply directly to the Secretary-General or the executive head of a separately administered fund or programme for an evaluation of the contested administrative decision and that a reasoned response would be provided in 45 days. He also states that in order to avoid the perception of conflict of interest, management evaluations would be carried out by a separate unit in the Department of Management. The Secretary-General considers that this step would constitute an essential new tool for holding managers more accountable, since the results would be reflected in their performance appraisal system records and performance compacts with the Secretary-General. Furthermore, by reducing the number of cases that go to litigation, it would make the system more cost-effective.

34. The Advisory Committee has consistently supported all measures that facilitate the amicable settlement of disputes and reduce litigation. **The Committee stresses, in this regard, the importance of the general principle of exhausting administrative remedies before formal proceedings are instituted.** It also agrees that the introduction of the results of such management evaluations in the performance records of managers would constitute a new element of accountability (see General Assembly resolution 59/283, para. 32).

35. At the same time, the proposed management evaluation has similarities with the administrative review process with respect to the purpose of the evaluation, what is expected to be accomplished and the placement of the unit responsible for carrying out the evaluation within the Department of Management. As the recommendation of the Redesign Panel with respect to the abolition of the administrative review was clear and unambiguous, it is important that concerns about similarities between that process and the proposal of the Secretary-General for a management evaluation be addressed.

36. **The Advisory Committee considers that the current proposal of the Secretary-General to place the management evaluation unit in the Department of Management presents a risk of a perception of conflict of interest. Responsibility for the management evaluation function should not lie with those whose policies or decisions are, in fact, under scrutiny. In effect, the management evaluation unit would be examining administrative decisions for which authority flows from the Secretary-General to the Department of Management, which in turn delegates some functions to the remaining departments. It is precisely those decisions that are contested and are the object of the dispute.**

37. **Furthermore, one of the main findings of the Redesign Panel was that the staff of the Organization have little or no confidence in the system as it currently exists. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee considers it essential to promote full confidence in the new system of internal justice by ensuring the independence and impartiality of this process. Safeguards should be provided against undue pressure being brought on staff members availing themselves of the new system.**

38. **Subject to these concerns, the Advisory Committee sees merit in a management evaluation function. It agrees that every effort should be made to promote the informal resolution of disputes to avoid unnecessary litigation. The Committee also agrees that the Administration should be offered an opportunity to redress faulty administrative decisions. The Committee recommends that the General Assembly consider placing the management evaluation unit elsewhere in the Organization, for example, in the Executive Office of the Secretary-General. With respect to the responsibility for formulating decisions on appeals, the Committee recalls paragraph 17 of General Assembly resolution 59/283 in which the Assembly decided that measures should be taken to eliminate the appearance of conflict of interest, and towards this end requests the Secretary-General to proceed with the transfer of the responsibility for formulating decisions on appeals from the Department of Management of the Secretariat to the Office of the Secretary-General.**

39. **Furthermore, the Advisory Committee emphasizes that the management evaluation unit would have to be accorded operational independence so as to ensure its objectivity and efficiency. The Secretary-General should be requested to assess the feasibility and other consequences of this option and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly.**

40. **The timeliness of the proceedings is also a very valid concern. In that context, the Advisory Committee considers that the management evaluation function should be completed in a shorter time frame than the proposed 45 days and it recommends that a reasoned response be provided promptly, with the period not to exceed 30 days.**

A two-tiered system of formal justice

41. The Redesign Panel recommends the establishment of a two-tiered system of formal justice, comprising a first-instance decentralized tribunal, the United Nations Dispute Tribunal, which would replace the Joint Appeals Board and the Joint Disciplinary Committees, and a second-tier appellate Tribunal, the United Nations Appeals Tribunal, created through the amendment of the statutes and the renaming of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal (see A/61/205, para. 154).

42. **The Advisory Committee sees merit in the Redesign Panel's recommendations concerning the establishment of a two-tiered system of formal justice. In this connection, it points out that the forthcoming report concerning disciplinary proceedings (see para. 10 above) may have a bearing on the proposed system.**

43. The Secretary-General agrees with these recommendations. However, he proposes that cases at the first level be decided by a panel of three judges instead of one, as proposed by the Redesign Panel. He argues that in order to reflect the multicultural nature of the Organization, representation of more than one legal system is required (see A/61/758, para. 19).

44. **The Advisory Committee is not convinced, however, that more than one judge is indeed required with respect to the decisions to be made at the first-level Tribunal.** In that context, the Committee recalls that the decisions of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal would be based essentially on the application of the rules and regulations of the United Nations and its funds and programmes. Moreover, the new system of internal justice would provide for an appellate tribunal, which would allow a recourse against decisions made at the first level. Furthermore, the Committee points out that judgements of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal are passed by a panel of three members and that the amendments proposed to article 8 of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal provide that cases presenting significant questions of law may be referred for consideration by the entire Tribunal (see A/61/205, annex II). The Committee also notes that the Redesign Panel considers it advisable to retain some elements of peer review, with assessors sitting with judges in serious cases. **The Committee is of the view that the proposal of the Redesign Panel provides sufficient safeguards to ensure that the law is properly applied.**

45. Concerning the jurisdiction and powers of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal, the Advisory Committee notes that the Secretary-General disagrees with

some aspects of the proposals made by the Redesign Panel (see A/61/205, para. 160 and A/61/758, para. 26). **The Committee recommends that the guidance of the Sixth Committee be sought on this matter, taking into account General Assembly resolutions 51/226; 55/159; 57/307 and 59/283.**

Compensation

46. With respect to compensation, the Advisory Committee notes that the Secretary-General agrees with the recommendations of the Redesign Panel with some modifications. The Redesign Panel recommends that the United Nations Dispute Tribunal be accorded the power to order specific performance, including the setting aside of an appointment and the awarding of exemplary and punitive damages (see A/61/205, paras. 83 (a) and (b), and 169). The Secretary-General proposes that in cases challenging appointments, promotions or terminations that the Dispute Tribunal be required to set the amount of compensation to be paid as an alternative to specific performance and that appointments not be set aside. In addition, the Secretary-General proposes that the current limit of two years' salary as compensation should be removed. Punitive and exemplary damages would not, however, be awarded (see A/61/758, paras. 21 and 22). The Committee recalls General Assembly resolution 55/159, annex, article 10), on this subject. **The Committee recommends that the opinion of the Sixth Committee be sought on this matter.**

Selection and appointment of judges

47. The Redesign Panel recommends that an Internal Justice Council be established to compile lists of candidates for appointment as judges of the United Nations Dispute Tribunal by the Secretary-General and the United Nations Appeals Tribunal by the General Assembly, as well as to monitor the system (see A/61/205, paras. 173 and 174). The Secretary-General accepts those recommendations. The Internal Justice Council would consist of a staff representative, a management representative and two distinguished external jurists (one nominated by the staff and one by management) and chaired by another distinguished external jurist appointed by the Secretary-General after consultation with the other four members.

48. **It is the view of the Advisory Committee that the effectiveness of such a body will depend largely on the expertise of its members. However, from the proposals before the Committee, it is not clear how the Internal Justice Council would be constituted, the precise role it would play and the process that would be applied for the selection of its members. The Committee is concerned that very little emphasis has been placed on the legal and judicial expertise, experience and qualifications of its members, which are of paramount importance. It reiterates its comments, made in paragraph 30 above, concerning the committee for the selection of ombudsmen, about the necessity for a fair, impartial and transparent process that could capture a large pool of potential candidates with the requisite professional qualifications and that could ensure that appropriate measures for the verification of the qualifications of the candidates are in place.**

49. **Should the General Assembly decide to establish the Internal Justice Council, the Advisory Committee recommends that the Assembly request the Secretary-General to elaborate and submit for its consideration the Council's terms of reference and the criteria for selection of its members.**

50. The Advisory Committee notes that the Redesign Panel proposed that the United Nations Dispute Tribunal judges be remunerated at the Assistant Secretary-General level and that in paragraph 33 of his note, the Secretary-General proposed that the remuneration of all Dispute Tribunal judges be at the D-2 level. As recommended by the Panel, the Secretary-General agrees that United Nations Appeals Tribunal judges should receive an honorarium similar to that paid to the judges of the ILO Administrative Tribunal.

51. The Advisory Committee notes that, at this stage, it is not clear whether the work of the judges of the Dispute Tribunal will be full-time. It also notes that their workload will depend on a number of decisions to be made by the General Assembly on the system of internal justice. The Committee believes that the question of remuneration of judges of both Tribunals (the Dispute Tribunal and the Appeals Tribunal) should be considered following General Assembly action. It considers, therefore, that it is premature to take a position on these proposals and will revert to this question at a later stage.

Disciplinary matters

52. **The Advisory Committee will comment on the recommendations concerning disciplinary matters when the report of the Secretary-General on the outcome of the intersessional working group of the Staff-Management Coordination Committee is submitted (see para. 10 above).**

VI. Other

53. The Redesign Panel recommends that proceedings in the formal justice system be brought against the Organization or the relevant fund or programme, rather than against the Secretary-General or the executive heads (A/61/205, para. 172). The Advisory Committee notes that the Secretary-General shares the Panel's view (A/61/758, para. 34). **The opinion of the Sixth Committee should be sought on this matter.**

54. Training requirements for persons serving as judges, ombudsmen, legal representatives, registrars, mediators and court and office staff are outlined in paragraphs 115 to 119 of the report of the Redesign Panel, including programmes on United Nations familiarization and the unique nature of the United Nations, the new justice system, judicial mediation, court administration and conflict prevention and resolution. Outreach programmes to inform staff of the new system of internal justice are also envisaged. The Redesign Panel states that the efficacy of the proposed reforms to both the formal and informal justice systems depends on the careful education and training of the relevant personnel. In its resolution 59/283, the General Assembly also emphasizes the importance of training.

55. The Advisory Committee encourages the development of more focused and results-oriented training programmes, taking into account the lessons learned from past experiences.

Documentation

- Report of the Redesign Panel on the United Nations system of administration of justice (A/61/205)
- Note by the Secretary-General on the report of the Redesign Panel on the United Nations system of administration of justice (A/61/758)
- General Assembly resolution 59/283
- Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the Ombudsman (A/61/524)
- Report of the Secretary-General on the administration of justice in the Secretariat: implementation of resolution 59/283 (A/61/342)
- Report of the Secretary-General on the administration of justice in the Secretariat: outcome of the work of the Joint Appeals Board during 2004 and 2005 and statistics on the disposition of cases and work of the Panel of Counsel (A/61/71)
- Report on the seventh special session of the Staff Management Coordination Committee held at Nairobi from 29 January to 6 February 2007 (SMCC/SS-VII/2007)